

1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4667

ful since Russia has undertaken extending foreign aid. Also, criticism of United States aid could even be Communist inspired. Yugoslavia should receive our continued aid in order to provoke other satellites to break with Russia. India's economy should be bolstered by the United States to compete with Russia's development of China, India's neighbor. Otherwise India will turn to Russia.

Arguments against: The foreign aid program has become too complex. So there is no accurate accounting and bookkeeping. It is too big for thorough understanding. Most dangerous of all, some information is classified as secret, which prevents Congress even knowing the facts and in effect results in Congress being asked to sign a blank check. In United States policy, or lack of policy, in dispensing lavish material aid in the past, there is a failure to sell American ideals and beliefs abroad or to prevent a spread of communism. Our policy is negative, based on fear of communism. Also, in support of the free world we failed to stipulate what recipient nations are expected to do in order to keep the world free. We are bolstering certain governments we should not: Yugoslavia is not our friend and here we are supporting communism; India is not neutral but favors Russia and here we are supporting socialism. Are we arming future enemies under the guise of neutrality? The weakening of United States economy by huge financial expenditures is dangerous; our bankruptcy is the Communist' goal. Our program has failed to develop an adequate defense posture against Soviet military power and has failed to reach the people themselves in underdeveloped nations. Study of our past efforts uncover unwise programming, unsound fiscal practices and lack of understanding in our execution in foreign nations. For these reasons the Hoover Commission advised of the urgent need for a complete study of the program. At least 2 years of military aid money is still on hand unspent, "in the pipeline," without any further appropriation.

## NOW, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Here's what I think—again, necessarily stated too briefly in this space: The many conflicting statements and bookkeeping errors involving hundreds of millions prove the program now needs overhauling. It is high time to revalue this program. In addition to the \$38.9 billion for defense here and abroad already voted this year, there is still enough money on hand for 2½ years expenditures in foreign aid at the current rate. I believe the time has come for the American people to make it plain to the world that we cannot support the world, nor help those who will not, or reluctantly, help themselves. I criticized Congress for debating for too long over how much aid rather than any aid, and the loss of congressional control now over our foreign aid expenditures. A highlight of debate was Chairman RICHARD's denunciation of the joint stand by Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Minority Leader JOE MARTIN when they championed the full amount for foreign aid.

Mr. RICHARDS said that they are repudiating the action of a House committee and surrendering to the executive department without facts and figures in a matter about which they do not know. India and Yugoslavia should not be given any aid it seems to me. Most important, it is impossible to cast a vote conscientiously for this program when for reasons of secrecy I, as your Congressman, have not even been given the facts. This reason alone would preclude my voting for this bill. Who could do otherwise?

Some say the doctrine of human equality is to be found in the Constitution. Some say it is in the Bill of Rights. Others say it is in the Bible. Those who propagate falsehood are ashamed to admit where it came from, so they lie as to its source.

The doctrine of human equality is to be found neither in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, nor the Bible. That doctrine is to be found in Das Kapital, which is the Bible of communism. All Communist-front organizations in America propagate the doctrine that all men are equal. It has been written into sociology textbooks and is being taught in practically all the schools and colleges of America. The doctrine that all men are equal is the scrubbrush that is used to brainwash the unstable intelligentsia of America. The Supreme Court of the United States has been thoroughly brainwashed with that brush. It may be found in decisions of the Court and in magazine articles written by several individual judges.

In its decision of May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court struck down the law of this land as set forth in the Constitution and as affirmed by numerous decisions of the Supreme Court and attempted to make new law for this land based upon sociology. The principal work cited as "modern authority" in the decision was the American Dilemma, written by a Swedish Marxist, Gunnar Myrdal. In its decision the court held in effect that it could find no basis for integration in the Constitution or the law and therefore it turned to psychology and sociology. It cited Myrdal's American Dilemma as the "modern authority" for its decision. On page 4 of that book Myrdal obligingly defined what he called the "American creed." He said that the "American creed" is "the fundamental equality of all men." In the same sentence he said that the tenets of that creed "were written into the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and into the constitutions of the several States. The ideals of the American creed have thus become the highest law of the land."

Other sociological authorities cited by the Court maintain the same thesis that all men are equal.

Recently Thurgood Marshall explained it all. The current issue of the Phi Delta Phi Brief carries, on page 244, the report of a speech made by Thurgood Marshall to a group at Columbia University, one of my alma maters, on January 9 of this year. Here is a part of that report:

"The initial blueprint was to force equality on the separate but equal doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. Realizing the ineffectiveness of this approach, NAACP then decided on the concept of social science, of finding a basis on which it could meet the law in order to satisfy the court. Running concurrently was the need to reflect court changes in changes of tactics. Anthropologically, both races are of the same physical makeup, and of the same capabilities. The harming influence is the segregation acting on the young child's mind which impedes his education and throws him behind his white contemporaries. With acceptance of mental damage in a lower court, the issue was raised for the Supreme Court, with even stipulations of equality that did not exist in order to get the issue clearly before the court, since the lower court had no authority to overrule *Plessy*. The result, re education, was *Brown v. Board of Education*, this by a unanimous court that was by no means expected."

There you see that the "blueprint" of the NAACP was to brainwash the Court with "the concept of social science" as "a basis on which it could meet the law in order to satisfy the Court." The "concept of social science" to which Marshall referred was the bogus concept that "all men are equal."

Vehicles for the dissemination of news and information are now heavily laden with the thesis that America was founded on the proposition that "all men are equal." That statement may be found stated and restated a thousand times in the textbooks that our children study in school, in the newspapers, and throughout the writings of Marxists, sociologists, Communists, and of many unthinking people including hundreds of assorted doctors of this and that who often wear ceremonial gowns to enhance their sense of self-importance. No one questions the right of all men to equal justice under the law, but propagandists have carried the doctrine beyond equality of right to equality of things and men are heard to proclaim human equality who would revolt at the suggestion that all cattle, all dogs, or all race-horses are equal.

A specious falsehood, oft repeated, finally becomes a belief and at last a creed. The statement that "all men are equal" is not only the spurious basis and foundation of the racial integration decisions of the Supreme Court, but it has even been written into canned speeches read by late Presidents. Speech writers for Cabinet Members and Vice Presidents have done the same thing. A studied campaign originating in Moscow in 1928 and now directed from northern Europe is fruitful for those who sponsor it.

The civil rights program of President Eisenhower embraces a bill introduced by Mr. CELLER, of Brooklyn, N. Y., being "House Resolution 627," which proclaims that the whole civil-rights program is based upon "the American principle of \* \* \* equality." Wherever we go and whatever we read we encounter repeatedly the same statement that America was founded upon the proposition that "all men are equal."

Many claim that the doctrine of human equality is in the Declaration of Independ-

There is not one word in the Declaration of Independence, or in the United States Constitution, or Bill of Rights that says directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, that "all men are equal." By a Marxist trick, Thurgood Marshall used Myrdal and others to seduce the inexperienced Judges of the Supreme Court into believing that human equality is somehow imposed by our fundamental law and some of the weaker of the Judges of that court actually believe that their integration decision of May 17, 1954, vindicated an American doctrine.

The proposition that "all men are equal" is nowhere to be found in our history except as a perversion, repudiated in the Constitution itself. The Declaration of Independence is not a part of our fundamental laws. It never became living law in America. The Declaration of Independence proclaimed that "all men are created equal." We now address ourselves to the meaning and intent of those who used that phrase in July 1776. The Supreme Court goes strong for "the intent of the framers" of the Constitution which it now finds in the half-demented mind of an alien from Sweden. We go to the minds that made the words.

In late May 1776 the Colony of Virginia authorized its delegates to the Continental Congress to introduce a resolution calling for a Declaration of Independence. At the time it declared its own independence of the British Government. Since Virginia declared its independence of British government it became necessary for her to substitute a government made by its own people for that imposed by England. A few Virginians had already foreseen the necessity of having a plan of government immediately available to take the place of the British plan. As a matter of fact, the Continental Congress a few weeks before had recommended the adoption of temporary plans of government by the several colonies. Of the several plans offered in Virginia, Edmund Randolph, said that there was one plan that "swallowed up all the rest."

The plan to which Edmund Randolph was referring was written by a Virginia farmer—not a lawyer. He was a student of history and the greatest constitutionalist the world has ever known. He had prepared a declaration of rights for Virginia in 18 paragraphs. The preamble to that declaration stated it to be "the basis and foundation of government" in Virginia.

The first paragraph of it was as follows:

"Then all men are born equally free and independent and have certain inherent natural rights, of which they cannot, by any compact, deprive, or divest their posterity; among which are the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

That original draft in 18 paragraphs was published in the Philadelphia newspapers of June 6, June 8, and June 12 and was published in nearly every other newspaper in America. A few days later Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Livingston, and Robert Sherman were named as a committee to write the Declaration of Independence. They found no difficulty in preparing the charges against George III, detailed in the Declaration of Independence, but it was late in June before they were able to put together a suitable preamble. Thomas Jefferson, to whom was assigned the task of writing a preamble, took the first three paragraphs of the Virginia Declaration of Rights and rearranged them to make a preamble for the Declaration of Independence. Before that time the Virginia convention had officially adopted the Virginia Declaration of Rights and had changed the first paragraph to read as follows:

"That all men are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights, or which when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

Jefferson rearranged and rephrased the first paragraph so as to make it say, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Thus we see that the "basis and foundation" of the first government in America was equality of freedom and independence. The Jefferson perversion was equality at creation. The Declaration of Independence does not say that all men are equal. It says that they were created equal. There equality ended. Creation is over when life begins. The rich man makes no more dust than the poor man, and he makes no more noise. The same analogy applies as between the doctor of pseudo-socio-science and a Chinese laundryman, but no doctor will concede the Chinaman to be his equal in life. All leave equal residue in their graves as all were equal before life began. Racers are equally stanced before the start but it is inequality that makes the race. Equality at creation or in death does not mean equality in life. Nevertheless, the Declaration of Independence is constantly cited as authority for the proposition that human equality is the "American Creed."

Why did Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams adopt language for the Declaration that might be susceptible of misconstruction by Marxists, doctors, eggheads, screwballs, crackpots, fools, and others? The answer is not difficult. It is explained in the writings of John Adams. Prior to 1776 two half-demented philosophers of France, named Helvetius and Rousseau, had maintained that "all men are equal". That philosophy had caught on with the simple-minded peasants and pseudo-philosophers of France. Nothing appealed so powerfully to the ignorant French peasants as the doctrine that "all men are equal". To the peasant that meant that all men are kings. The slogan was echoed all over France: "Every man a king." The thought didn't occur to them that if all men are kings, then all might be peasants or slaves. The Declaration of Independence was written for the purpose of bringing France into the Revolution on the side of America. The war had been going on for a full year. America was in an unequal struggle for life over death. Washington had been at the head of America's armies a year before July 4, 1776. Washington's task looked hopeless. Jefferson's task was to win the case for America by writing a powerful preamble that would appeal to the hearts—not the minds—of the French people. Then, as now, the French acted on emotions—not reasons. Since the doctrine of human equality had become a popular creed in France and since Helvetius and Rousseau were the prophets of that creed, Jefferson directed the Declaration at the hearts of the French people by declaring that "all men are created equal" Jefferson won his case with the simple minds of France, but lost it with the simple minds of America's future.

In their old age Thomas Jefferson and John Adams became bosom friends. On the 13th day of July 1813, Adams' mind went back to July 4, 1776, when he and Jefferson labored together in Philadelphia. He wrote to Jefferson that day:

"Inequalities of mind and body are so established by God Almighty in his constitution of human nature, that no art or policy can ever plane them down to a level. I have

never read reasoning more absurd, sophistry more gross, in proof of the Athanasiian creed, or transubstantiation, than the subtle labors of Helvetius and Rousseau to demonstrate the natural equality of mankind. *Jus cuique, the golden rule, do as you would be done by, is all the equality that can be supported or defended by reason or common sense.*"

About a year later, on the 15th day of April, 1814, the same John Adams who had helped Jefferson and Franklin write the Declaration of Independence wrote to John Taylor, of Virginia, in part, as follows:

"Inequalities are a part of the natural history of man. I believe that none but Helvetius will affirm, that all children are born with equal genius. \* \* \*

"That all men are born to equal rights is true. Every being has a right to his own, as clear, as moral, as sacred, as any other being has. This is as indubitable as a moral government in the universe. But to teach that all men are born with equal powers and faculties, to equal influence in society, to equal property and advantages through life, is as gross a fraud, as glaring an imposition on the credulity of the people as ever was practiced \* \* \* by the self-styled philosophers of the French Revolution. For honor's sake, Mr. Taylor, for truth and virtue's sake, let American philosophers and politicians despise it." All Americans thought alike on the subject in 1776. Benjamin Franklin, a few days after the Declaration was promulgated, helped to write a Declaration of Rights for the State of Pennsylvania. Franklin had been willing to deface the classic words of George Mason's Virginia Declaration of Rights to appeal to the simple-minded philosophers and peasants of France but he was unwilling to deface those lines and firmed for the ages the profound wisdom of the *Cato* of his country when he sat down to make a basis and foundation for government in Pennsylvania. He copied the Virginia Declaration of Rights almost verbatim. His first paragraph was as follows:

"That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, amongst which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety."

The basis and foundation of Franklin's government was the same as that written by George Mason for Virginia. It was equality of freedom and independence. Two years later John Adams was named as chairman of a committee to prepare a declaration of rights for Massachusetts. While he too had been willing to deface the words of the Virginia declaration of rights in order to appeal to most of the 25 million people in France, only one-half million of whom could read, he was unwilling to perpetuate that defacement as living law in Massachusetts. The first paragraph of his original declaration of rights copies that of Virginia also and was:

"All men are born equally free and independent, and have certain natural, essential, and unalienable rights, among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing, and protecting their property; in fine, that of seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

Given a choice between equality of freedom equality at creation, or equality of men, not one of the original 13 States wrote either equality at creation or equality of men into their fundamental laws.

When the United States Constitution was under discussion at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787 not one delegate from any of the 12 States represented suggested that "all men are equal" either at creation or in life.

On June 26, 1787, on the floor of that convention Alexander Hamilton said:

"Inequality will exist as long as liberty exists. It unavoidably results from that very liberty itself."

Every mind in the convention assented to that statement. Freedom, liberty and independence are the basis and foundation of government in America. Equality of men is the central theme of Marxism. Marxism cannot live in a land where men are free. Marxist equality is the scavenger that eats out the vitals of liberty and freedom. It is the "come-on" of communism and is the doctrinal basis for totalitarianism. Nothing in the writings of any of the fathers of freedom in America justifies the libelous assertion that one of them believed or urged the doctrine that "all men are equal". The doctrine of human equality is the reverse of the doctrines they espoused.

The Constitution proclaims in its preamble that it was established "to \* \* \* insure domestic tranquility \* \* \* and secure the blessings of liberty". Nowhere does it hint a purpose to insure domestic strife or secure degrading equality.

The same Myrdal who defined the "American Creed" as the "fundamental equality of all men," say on page 9 of his atrocity that equality and liberty cannot co-exist—that there is an "inherent conflict" between them and "equality is slowly winning." He told the truth. For 200 years this Nation has been a land of liberty—a haven of freedom in the dismal history of man. Equality of freedom and independence became the American Creed at the Revolution. All States and the United States wrote them into their fundamental laws and rejected the specious and depraved doctrine of human equality.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, is from California. The Declaration of Rights of his home State is almost a verbatim copy of the official Virginia Declaration of Rights. It says that "all men are by nature free and independent". There is not a word in the constitution or Bill of Rights of California sustaining the doctrine of the equality of men. It repudiates that doctrine.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, is from Kansas. If he will examine the Declaration of Rights of his home State he will find that its first paragraph is as follows:

"All men are by nature free and independent, and have certain inalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining happiness and safety."

Not a word is to be found in the fundamental law of Kansas that says directly or indirectly that "all men are equal." It repudiates that doctrine.

On August 14, 1862, Abraham Lincoln, speaking to large groups of Negro delegates in Washington, said:

"You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races.

Whether it be right or wrong I need not discuss; but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think.

Your race suffer very greatly, many of them by living among us, while ours suffer from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least, why we should be separated.

Even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with white people. On this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of ours. Go where you are treated the best, and the ban is still upon you. I cannot alter it if I would. \* \* \* See our present condition—the country engaged in war, our white men cutting one another's throats, and then

consider what we know to be the truth. But for your race among us there would be no war, although many men engaged on either side do not care for you one way or the other. It is better for us both, therefore, to be separated."

On the battlefield of Gettysburg in 1864 Abraham Lincoln recited a political speech, the first sentence of which was:

"Four score and 7 years ago our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

At the hour when Lincoln made that speech the Declaration of Rights of his home State of Illinois proclaimed "that all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, and of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness."

On and on we might go demonstrating that the doctrine of human equality is unknown in American Government and that the doctrine of equality of freedom and independence, first set forth in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, has been copied throughout America. The doctrine of the equality of all men never took root in America. It is living law nowhere. The nearest approach to human equality is in Russian slave camps where all men are equally poor and degraded. Three million party members rule 180 million slaves with an iron hand.

While Russia has partially succeeded in reducing most of her people to the level of degradation approaching "equality," she has been careful not to interfere with the segregation practices and racial mores of her people. Even Russian despots have more sense than to attempt to do a thing like that. That low mark was reserved for American despots sitting on judicial benches.

In the summer of 1955 Justice Douglas and Robert F. Kennedy, an Attorney for a Senate committee, toured Russia. Douglas found something he didn't want to tell. Kennedy spilled it in the New York Times magazine of Sunday, April 8, 1956. Here is a part:

#### IV. SEGREGATION

"In every city that we visited there were two different school systems. There was one set of schools for the local children—those of a different color and race from the European Russian children. State and collective farms were operated by one group or the other, rarely by a mixture of both.

"Although work is supposedly being done to minimize the differences, many of the cities we visited were still split into two sections, with the finer residential areas being reserved for the European Russians. European Russians coming into the area receive a 30 percent wage preferential over local inhabitants doing the same jobs. The whole pattern of segregation and discrimination was as pronounced in this area as virtually anywhere else in the world."

A distinguishing feature of communism is that it never practices what it preaches. It says one thing and does another.

At the Eighth Congress of the Communist International held in Moscow in 1928, methods to be used to destroy true representatives governments by free people were fully discussed. It was revealed in the March issue 1956 of the National Republic Magazine published in Washington, D. C., that advocacy of "social equality" among the races was agreed upon there as the surest method for the destruction of free government in America. Since class hatred is the sure-fire communist weapon to bring about internal strife and finally revolution, Moscow adopted the slogan of "human equality", for the contest that has already done more harm to

America than can ever be repaired. A proud nation of patriots has become a nation of fools.

After the War Between the States, "civil rights" or force bills were enacted by Congress and the prostrate and helpless southern people were put under rule by bayonets, as is again threatened. Under the protection of soldiers, illiterate negroes were commissioned to rule the white people throughout much of the South. They were put in charge of the legislative assemblies of the various southern states. The carpetbaggers of the late 1860's were the proponents of the insane doctrine that "all men are equal." While the white man was disfranchised for his loyalty to his race, his home and country and the negro and sociologists ruled them, the American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was stricken from the bills of rights of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, and South Carolina, and either the carpetbag doctrine of the equality of men or the specious doctrine of equality at creation were written into all their bills of rights. As soon as the "carpetbaggers" and "scalawags" were run out of the South by the courageous white people, everyone of those states called constitutional conventions and struck from their fundamental laws every vestige of the foul doctrine that "all men are equal", with one exception. That exception was the State of North Carolina. The carpetbaggers were never run out of North Carolina. The white people ran them as far as her college campuses where they became "doctors", put on caps and gowns and began screaming "academic freedom"! There they and their descendants yet remain, crying "academic freedom"! and the grand old American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence that stood in North Carolina's Declaration of Rights from 1777 until 1868 is yet displaced by the senseless substitute.

The American doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was copied into the celebrated French Declaration of Rights of 1789. In the bath of blood we know as the French Revolution, the doctrine of human equality was substituted in the French Declaration of 1793. In the same bath of blood the French Revolutionary motto became: "Liberty, equality, and fraternity."

In 1940 France struck the doctrine of human equality from the motto upon the tomb of her liberty. That cluster of inconsistencies no longer tarnishes the tricolor of France. But France is dead. The doctrine that all men are equal reduced France to a pitiable position in the family of nations. In 1946 the doctrine of human equality was stricken from the French Declaration of Rights and the doctrine of equality of freedom and independence was reinserted just as it was copied from Virginia in 1789. But too late. When the spirit of a nation dies, when proud patriots become groveling internationalists, when pride of race is gone, the nation is dead. Where once was glory and grandeur, as in Rome and Greece, goats will browse among her moldering ruins and lizards sun upon her broken statuary. Equality made France a third-class nation. It will make us a fourth-class race. I believe it was Lord Acton who said that the reason why the French Revolution became so destructive to human liberty was the doctrine of human equality. Napoleon looked back from St. Helena with the observation that France wanted equality more than it wanted liberty; and since it couldn't have both, he gave them equality.

Flowing naturally from the doctrine of human equality is the equally specious doctrine of the "brotherhood of man." The men of the gowns sometimes put it as "the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God." Some preachers throw their voices into ministerial overdrive and exclaim, "All

men are brothers." Well, if they are, no two brothers are equal. Identical twins are never identical. Some of our ministerial friends who proclaim that all men are brothers say they found it in the Bible, yet not one has ever cited the book, chapter and verse. They, too, poor things, have been brainwashed.

If all men are brothers, then all children are brothers and sisters and are equally entitled to inherit from their collective papa (the state) all that every real daddy has worked to accumulate for his brood. That is socialism—far gone on the road to communism. "Every man a king" or "all men are brothers" may appeal to doctors and their demented minds; but if true, all are slaves to the state. If all men are equal, or are brothers, why did Jesus have such a hard time picking 12 men? Why did he pick 12 Jews? If all were equal, how is it that one was a traitor? Judas may be the equal brother of some men. Indeed, we have many in America today who would disgrace Judas and put Benedict Arnold to shame.

Liberty is always destroyed in the name of liberty. Free government is always destroyed in the name of freedom. Religion is always destroyed in the name of religion. If all men are equal and all men are brothers, why don't we all go to the same church? The Methodist bishop won't consent for his brood to become Baptists. Some Presbyterians want to integrate with Negroes, but they want to fight if one suggests that they integrate with Methodists. That is different. They have been brainwashed. If all men are equal and are brothers, why do we have a heaven and a hell? Those kingdoms are monuments of God's truth eternal, that all men are not equal, and that there is some sort of segregation in the life everlasting. The pearly gates and the streets of gold are for the good. Fire and brimstone are for the bad.

It is equality of freedom and independence that gives unto man his free choice to be good or to be bad. Equality of men leaves no choice, because if all men are equal by nature or inherently there can be no differences and no distinctions.

In Harvard's better days her Charles W. Elliot taught: "inequality, not equality \*\*\* is the inevitable result of freedom." In Columbia's better days her Nicholas Murray Butler taught that equality is a "Shibboleth." Henry James described the doctrine of equality as "slander" by "the paid scribes of old-foggyism which no man who is not an ass can believe." Lord Acton, Edmund Burke, John Morley and hundreds of others have exposed the specious thing.

It is inequality that gives enlargement to religion, to intellect, to energy, to virtue, to love and to wealth. Equality of intellect stabilizes mediocrity. Equality of wealth makes every man poor. Equality of religion destroys all creeds. Equality of energy renders all men sluggards. Equality of virtue suspends all men without the gates of Heaven. Equality of love stultifies every man's passion, destroys every family altar and mongrelizes the races of men.

Equality of freedom and independence cannot exist without inequality in the rewards and earned fruits of that freedom and independence. It is inequality that makes "the pursuit of happiness" something more than a dry run or a futile chase. It is inequality that makes every game. Inequality results in heartaches for the loser, perhaps, but it is the father of every joy and every thrill.

Equality may be imposed only in a despotism. Equality beyond that range of legal rights is despotic restraint. It is nowhere sought to be imposed except in the communistic sewers of slavic slavery. As Francis Lieber pointed out in his great work on Civil Liberty (p. 334) 100 years ago: "Equality absolutely carried out leads to

communism." The prophesy is now being realized in America. We are there.

Equality homogenizes so that cream no longer rises to the top. It puts the eagle in the hen house that he may no longer soar. More than 2,000 years ago Aristotle proclaimed that equality may exist only among slaves. Russia is proving the postulate.

### The Ultra-High-Frequency Problem in Television

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 11, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the following letter written by the Joint Council on Educational Television to the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

JOINT COUNCIL ON  
EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION,  
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1956.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Senate Interstate and Foreign  
Commerce Committee, Senate Office  
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your committee has been studying current problems in the field of telecommunications, including the obstacles that are being encountered in utilization of the ultra-high-frequency (UHF) channels allocated for television broadcasting. The Federal Communications Commission has likewise taken official cognizance of the UHF difficulties, and is presently engaged in a rulemaking proceeding to determine what action might be taken to improve the situation.

The Joint Council on Educational Television (JCET) is directly and deeply concerned with the UHF problem, and has participated both in the hearings conducted by your committee and in the proceedings before the Commission. Our most immediate interest, of course, lies in the channels that the Commission has reserved for noncommercial educational television, but we are fully aware that the future of educational television is dependent upon a sound allocations policy for the Nation as a whole.

Of the 258 channel assignments reserved for educational television, 86 are in the VHF and 172 in the UHF range. There are 21 noncommercial educational television stations now in operation. Sixteen of these are VHF and only five are UHF. In addition to the five communities where educational UHF stations are already on the air, UHF channels have been reserved in New York, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cleveland, Buffalo, Atlanta, Kansas City, and many other communities in which large universities or other important educational institutions are located. It is apparent, therefore, that both the VHF and the UHF channels are of vital importance to educational television, and that its future development is seriously threatened by the adverse factors that have plagued and delayed the development of UHF television generally.

Accordingly, the JCET has followed with close attention the testimony before your committee and the comments that have been filed in the Commission's rulemaking proceeding. We believe that both inquiries are

of great value, and in their light we have come to certain conclusions about the UHF problem, which are embodied in this letter.

Above all, we are convinced that the development of a satisfactory national television service, ample for the expanding and varied requirements of the American future, cannot possibly be achieved without vigorous and extensive exploitation of the UHF channels. Several proposals have been advanced which envisage the concentration of television broadcasting in the VHF channels, but these offer only a restricted and incomplete service wholly inadequate for our foreseeable needs.

The converse suggestion that the VHF channels should be abandoned in favor of a purely UHF allocations system, is perhaps closer to the mark. Nevertheless, it does not appear feasible or desirable in the present state of the art. Certain technical problems in the UHF field, and the enormous investment by the public in VHF receivers and by broadcasters in VHF transmitters, alike dictate caution before so radical a shift is set- tled upon. If, in the course of scientific advance, a purely UHF service should emerge as the best solution, still there would necessarily be a considerable period of transition and conversion, to minimize capital sacrifices and avoid the loss of service to millions of viewers.

But whether the ultimate allocations basis of television broadcasting be purely UHF or both VHF and UHF, it is plain that the UHF channels must be a stable and vigorous if not the dominant component. "There is no known alternative." Dr. E. W. Engstrom, of the Radio Corporation of America pointed out in the course of your hearings, "for we need the UHF channels in addition to the VHF channels for our still-growing black-and-white service and for the color service which is the newest of the mass communications media."

From the time of its inception as a broadcasting service in the Commission's 1952 television allocations plan, UHF television has confronted two primary obstacles: The existence of millions of receivers equipped only for VHF viewing, and slower technical development of UHF. These adverse factors have badly undermined UHF's ability to compete with VHF, and have tended to "snowball," so that UHF troubles are aggravated today far beyond what they were 2 years ago. The manufacture of all-channel receivers has declined, the viewing public has been slow to spend the money for conversion of VHF receivers to all-channel reception, networks have been reluctant to affiliate with UHF stations, and many UHF broadcasters have found it necessary to suspend operations.

If the present dangerous trend is to be checked, and UHF television put back on the road to health and growth, it appears to us that three basic steps must be taken:

(1) The manufacture of all-channel receivers must increase sharply, and substantially all receivers offered for purchase must be capable of all-channel reception;

(2) The competitive position of UHF must be bolstered by the creation and preservation of substantial geographical areas in which UHF is the sole or predominant television service; and

(3) The technical problems of UHF transmission and reception must be promptly and vigorously attacked, and the frontiers of the art pushed forward so that UHF will be as familiar as VHF to television engineers and servicemen.

It will be noted that the first of these measures is primarily the responsibility of the Congress, the second of the Commission, and the third of the telecommunications industry. In our opinion, each of the three is vital to the sound development of our national television system, and only by such a broad plan, and with the joint participa-